

## PRACTICE OF PHARMACY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEBRUARY 8, 1927.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the  
state of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. McLEOD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia,  
submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany S. 4474]

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4474) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass with amendments.

The primary purpose of the bill is to bring up to modern standards the licensing of pharmacists in the District of Columbia, in line with the general advancement in the profession, and the increased knowledge necessary because of the progress of medical science.

The present law governing the licensing of pharmacists and purveyors of poisons was enacted 20 years ago. In the meantime there have been decided advances in knowledge of chemistry, as well as important developments with respect to use of serums and anti-toxins, coupled with improved pharmaceutical methods, all calling for greater skill and better technical education on the part of those charged with the responsibility of compounding and dispensing prescriptions, drugs, and poisons used in the sciences, arts, and professions.

The bill hereby reported makes three general changes in the existing law, and will, if enacted, be of benefit to the general public from the standpoint of insuring the highest degree of protection possible in the purchase of medicine and drugs.

The first change is the requirement that after the act becomes effective a person seeking to practice pharmacy in the District of Columbia must be a graduate of an accredited school or college of pharmacy, and possess three years' practical experience under a

licensed pharmacist. The existing law requires either a college education in pharmacy and three years' practical experience, or else simply four years' subordinate experience in the practice of pharmacy. It is believed that the greater demands made upon the knowledge of the pharmacist under present conditions necessitate the technical education acquired in colleges of pharmacy. The board of pharmacy is given authority by the bill to allow credit to applicants for licenses for actual experience in the practice of pharmacy acquired while the applicants are attending school.

The committee, by amendment, has added a provision postponing one year the effective date of the bill, if enacted. This will prevent injustice being done those persons who are now in the District of Columbia attempting to qualify for pharmacists' licenses by acquirement of practical experience alone, instead of through attendance at colleges of pharmacy.

The raising of educational standards is in harmony with legislation in the majority of States, and practically places the District of Columbia on a parity, with respect to qualifications of pharmacists, with the following:

Alabama.	Michigan.	Oregon.
Arkansas.	Minnesota.	Pennsylvania.
Connecticut.	Mississippi.	Rhode Island.
Idaho.	Missouri.	South Carolina.
Illinois.	New Jersey.	Utah.
Indiana.	New York.	Virginia.
Iowa.	North Carolina.	Washington.
Kentucky.	North Dakota.	West Virginia.
Louisiana.	Ohio.	
Maryland.	Oklahoma.	

The second change made by the bill is that which requires reregistration every three years. Now, after an applicant has been licensed as a pharmacist it is very difficult, if not impossible, to terminate his license in order to protect the public, no matter what his conduct or habits may be. The provision in the bill requiring reregistration or renewal of licenses every three years is not as drastic as the requirements of many States making such reregistration necessary either annually or biennially.

The committee, by amendment, has limited the power of the board of pharmacy to withhold or refuse renewals of pharmacists' licenses by providing for the granting of a formal hearing upon request of any party aggrieved and by appeal from the decision of the board, through writ of error, to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

The third change is an increase of the original registration fee from \$10 to \$15, and the provision for a \$3 fee in cases of reregistration or renewal of licenses. The fees are used by the board of pharmacy for general expenses and the expenses of the examinations, including the purchase of drugs and other materials used in practical prescription test work. Because of the limited size of the District of Columbia, there are not as many applicants for examination as in the several States, and therefore there probably never will be a large working capital for the use of the board of pharmacy. All of its expenses must be paid from the fund created by the fees, and the balance, if any, may be used for the payment as compensation to

members of the board of pharmacy, of such reasonable amounts as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may determine.

The bill has the approval of the Citizens' Advisory Council and also that of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The letters with reference to the proposed legislation are appended.

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL,  
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1926.

Report on H. R. 12017, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session.

Hon. F. N. ZIHLMAN,  
*Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia,*  
*House of Representatives.*

The Citizens' Advisory Council has had under consideration, upon your reference, a bill for the regulation of the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and recommends that the same be approved, as it will tend to standardize the requirements and improve the practice of all pharmacutists hereafter to be licensed and to more efficiently regulate the sale of poisons.

The essential differences between the provisions of the act of May 7, 1906, and the proposed bill may be briefly stated as follows:

Section 3 of the act of 1906 provides for a "board of supervisors in medicine and pharmacy," while the proposed bill establishes an independent "board of pharmacy." The same section provides that an applicant for license to practice pharmacy shall file an application under oath "setting forth the name and age of the applicant, the place or places at which he pursued, and the time spent in the study of pharmacy," whereas the proposed bill requires that said applicant "must be a graduate of an accredited school or college of pharmacy."

Referring to the examination of applicants for license, section 3, of the act of 1906, provides that "Any applicant intending to compound and dispense homeopathic remedies and prescriptions shall so state in his application for a license as a pharmacist and it shall thereupon become the duty of the board of supervisors aforesaid to appoint a committee of three, physicians or pharmacists, or both, adherents to the homeopathic system of medical practice, to examine said applicant in homeopathic materia medica and pharmacy and to report the result thereof to the board." Under the proposed bill, no distinction is made, but all applicants to practice pharmacy are to be uniformly subjected to examinations of the same general scope and character.

Section 7 of the act of 1906 and that of the proposed bill are identical, excepting that the words "every licensed pharmacist and every licensed dealer" and "board of pharmacy" in the latter are substituted for "board of supervisors" and "every licensed dealer" in the former.

Section 10 of the proposed bill differs from that of May 7, 1906, in that in the former a fee of \$15 is charged for an examination for license to practice pharmacy and \$3 for each renewal thereof, while in the latter, \$10 is the fee for an examination for license to practice pharmacy, no fee being charged for a renewal thereof.

The other provision of the act of May 7, 1906, affected by the proposed bill relates to the disposition of any balance which may be on hand at the close of the fiscal year. Owing to the composite character of the board of examiners, the present act provides that such balance "shall be divided among the several boards of examiners in proportion to the number of candidates examined by each, each member of said board of examiners to receive such part of the entire amount paid as that board itself may determine," whereas the proposed bill provides, "If any balance remains on hand on the 30th day of June of any year, the members of said board appointed as such shall be paid such reasonable amounts as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may determine."

Respectfully submitted.

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL,  
By JESSE C. SUTER, *Chairman.*

WASHINGTON, *June 11, 1926.*

Hon. F. N. ZIEHLMAN,  
Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to recommend favorable action on H. R. 12017, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 7, 1906, as amended," which you referred to them for consideration and report.

The object of this legislation is to provide additional safeguards governing the practice of pharmacy, and it is believed that the provisions of the bill are well drawn to cover the object sought to be accomplished.

Very truly yours,

J. F. BELL.

*Acting President Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.*